



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,390	11/20/2003	Ronald F. Palermo	10670013010202	9732
37211	7590	01/02/2009		
BASCH & NICKERSON LLP	EXAMINER			
1777 PENFIELD ROAD	WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL			
PENFIELD, NY 14526	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	1791			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/02/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dneels@bnpatentlaw.com  
dmasters@bnpatentlaw.com  
mnickerson@bnpatentlaw.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/718,390	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PALERMO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeff Wollschlager. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Duane C. Basch. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 December 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 20-23.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shaw et al.(US 6,033,146); Harvey (US 6,568,146); Danielsson (US 4,281,496).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative, Mr. Basch, and Ex. Wollschlager discussed the 9/17/08 non-final office action. Mr. Basch proposed an amendment to claims 20 and 22 directed to the grinding step and explained how this proposed amendment distinguishes over the Shaw et al. reference. Ex. Wollschlager suggested Mr. Basch submit the proposed amendment and REMARKS in writing for further consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jeff Wollschlager/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1791